

## Remarks

No amendments are presented in this paper.

Claims 31-66 are pending.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 31-61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, it was alleged that the recitation “encapsulating the second packet within the first packet” was not adequately described. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Applicants would like to draw Examiner’s attention to paragraph [0079] of the specification. This paragraph describes an embodiment in which a split identifier (SID) packet will include “an encapsulating packet and an encapsulated packet.” The paragraph goes on to state that the encapsulating packet may include a first identifier segment while the encapsulated packet may include second identifier segment in the encapsulated packet. An example of this embodiment is provided in Figure 2. In this example, the SID packet 200 is considered the encapsulating packet having a control portion 210 with a first SID segment 231 and the packet 250, which corresponds to data portion 220 of SID packet 200, is considered the encapsulated packet having a control portion 260 with a second SID segment 232.

The specification goes on to discuss how the first SID segment may be a storage area of a target device while the second SID segment may be a storage block of the storage area. See, e.g., paragraph [0081].

For at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully assert that the above-identified recitation is adequately described in the specification and request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection of these claims.

Claims 41-48 were additionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for allegedly being a single means claim. Specifically, the Examiner states that “claim 41 recites a controller and some functions of the controller but nothing else.” The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

While the Applicants do not necessarily concede that the language of claim 41 is

properly interpreted under 35 USC 112, paragraph six, the Applicants would nevertheless like to draw Examiner's attention to the two claim elements provided in claim 41. Claim 41 recites both a controller (having the ability to generate first packet, generate second packet, and encapsulate second packet within the first packet, as described) and a network interface coupled to the controller and configured to transmit the first packet to the target device.

For at least this reason, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection of these claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 31, 41, 56, and 62 were indicated as being allowable were the above rejections overcome. The Applicants thank Examiner for this recognition of allowable matter.

Conclusion

For these reasons, a Notice of Allowance, allowing claims 31-66, is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at 503-796-2972. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,  
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Dated: December 3, 2008

/Nathan R. Maki/

Nathan R. Maki  
Reg. No. 51,110

Pacwest Center, Suite 1900  
1211 SW Fifth Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Telephone: 503-222-9981